	1	
1 2 3 4 5	Stephen R. Cochell Admitted Pro Hac Vice srcochell@gmail.com 5850 San Felipe, Ste. 500 Houston Texas 77057 Telephone:(713) 436-8000 Facsimile: (213) 623-2000 Allan Grant (SBN#213658)	
6 7 8	Grant's Law Firm 17351 Greentree Drive Riverside, California 92503-6762 Telephone (888)937-7555 Facsimile (866)858-6637	
9	Attorneys for Defendant JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12 13	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14 15 16 17 18	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF, Defendant.	Case No. 5:23-cr-00021-JGB REPLY IN SUPPORT OF JASON CARDIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER RESTRAINING FURTHER VIOLATIONS DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT AGAINST UNAUTHORIZED DETENTION OR ARREST; TO PRODUCE EXTRADITION FILES
20		AND RELATED COMMUNICATIONS AND TO SET
$\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$		EXPEDITED BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE
22 23		
23 24		
2 4 25		
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 26 \end{bmatrix}$	The thrust of Mr. Cardiff's Ex Parta Application is to prevent the Government	
20 27	from further attempts to arrest Mr. Cardiff in violation of his Fourth Amendment	
28	rights. The Government has been aware of the arrest of Mr. Cardiff since January 14	

COCHELL LAW FIRM 2025 and is aware that Defendant contends that the prosecutors in this case directed Mr. Cardiff's arrest, which interfered with and violated the Court's travel order allowing Mr. Cardiff to be in Ireland. The Government prosecutors do not deny that they authorized Garda to arrest Defendant when they knew, full well, that as of January 14, 2025, he was authorized to be in Ireland. They do not deny that they sat on a warrant for thirteen months and directed its execution two days after counsel asked for an extension of time in Ireland to receive medical treatment. Their failure to deny or defend their conduct all but constitutes an admission that they directed an unauthorized arrest.

The Government could have cancelled the warrant, taken steps to handle this matter and/or communicated *something* to Defendant's counsel representing that they denied directing the arrest or would take steps to assure that further unauthorized steps were not taken against Mr Cardff. Instead, it appears that the prosecutors want to delay this matter as possible.

Defendant respectfully submits that he should not be left wondering whether the Government is going to again take matters into their own hands as this case progresses.

Technical defects in a pleading should not be grounds for dismissal if the pleadings sufficiently inform the opposing party of the claims against them. Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393 (9th Cir. 1998). Thus, the Court should reject the Government's argument that a separate document titled "Memorandum" must be filed. The Ex Parte Application does specify the order requested, statement of facts and points and authorities for consideration.

Defendant recognizes that the Government might need additional time to address the issue of an injunction. However, the Court can proceed in an orderly fashion—require production of the extradition file and set an expedited briefing and hearing schedule.

Case 5:23-cr-00021-JGB Document 183 Filed 01/28/25 Page 3 of 3 Page ID